

THE DOCTORS.



BY SAMUEL ROBERTS.

“Foul deeds will rise,
Though all the earth o’erwhelm them to men’s eyes.”

SHEFFIELD :

PRINTED BY A. WHITAKER AND CO. IRIS-OFFICE, FARGATE;
AND SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

1836.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b21535267>

THE DOCTORS.

"They seem to me like the blank leaves which in the Bible are placed between the Old and New Testament, dividing the two, but containing nothing of either."—SHERIDAN.

"Unless above this world he scan,
How mean how vile a thing is man."

EVERY man living who believes that there is a God, and that he himself is created by Him a responsible being, to be accountable in a future state, for all the things which he shall have done while here on earth, whether they may have been good or evil, must be convinced that it is no less his interest, than it is his duty, to exercise the peculiar talents (whatever they may be) with which he may have been endowed, in a way the most acceptable to the giver.

Our Saviour, in reply to a lawyer who asked him which was the great commandment, replied,—“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.” These are concise requirements, but they include a great deal. Not a single good *intention*, but a life of benevolent actions, seeking neither the praise of men, nor marvelling, though the hatred and annoyance of the world should be the consequence. So little, indeed, is the applause of the world desirable, that the only occasion when men are called upon by the Saviour to *rejoice* and be exceedingly glad, is, when they are persecuted, despitefully used, and all manner of evil falsely spoken against them by those whose ways they have opposed.

The foregoing are truths which have been so strongly and fully impressed upon my mind, even from my youth up, that I have always been so prepared for the shafts of calumny, that their number and annoying effects, have been fewer and less than I had anticipated. A recent instance, deeply affecting the interest of the public, has been one of the strangest of the kind that I have ever experienced. Though probably the principal aim of the offending party, has been the annoyance of myself; the circumstances of the case, and the evil results of their conduct, are of too general and dreadful a nature not to have demanded the fullest exposure and the strongest resistance. However *Christianity* may call upon us for charitable constructions and forgiveness of injuries, we have both the precepts and the example of its founder, for opposing, rebuking, and reprobating cruelty, oppression, and all evil ways, by whomsoever committed. This is for *their* good, as well as for that of others. We are not necessarily the enemies of such, because we boldly tell them the truth. I can safely

say, (though I certainly do not mean to let them entirely escape) that I harbour no malice or ill-will towards any of the party whose conduct I am thus called upon to expose and to reprobate.

There is no truth, whether relating to temporal or spiritual concerns, more strongly or more frequently enforced in the Scriptures, than that the oppression of the POOR—either by individuals or communities—is invariably productive of the displeasure and correction of the Almighty. If any thing were wanting to establish the correctness of these Scriptural denunciations, it would be supplied by the experience of all times and of all people. I fearlessly assert that there never was a country in which such an attempt was made, where it was not followed by the predicted result, nor was there ever a time in which the lower classes *in this country* were so little disposed to submit to oppression, or were so capable of resisting it as now.

It may be said that the very lowest—i. e. the pauper class—are but little to be feared, but let it be recollected that the *pauper* class are a part of the *labouring* class. Paupers have been labourers, and labourers may become paupers. Let war, a bad time of trade, or a dearth, such as most of us can remember, (a not improbable supposition) succeed to the present peace, good trade, and plenty, and what would be the consequence? Would the thousands of workmen, thrown out of employment,—with their wives and children—daily, weekly, and monthly selling their furniture, and sinking at last into the depth of poverty, bear to see their offspring perishing for want, or submit to have them packed like sheep in a pen, with thousands of others, no parents to protect them, and fed on the New Poor Law scale, of less, perhaps, than twopence per day? Would they bear this? while themselves and wives—torn asunder—were put into different prison houses, crowded to suffocation, clothed like galley slaves, and much worse fed on 1s. 3½d. per week, though they had probably been for twenty years paying poor rates without receiving a farthing? Is it possible to believe, that intelligent men like our present mechanics, knowing their strength and their rights, would bear this? What then would they do, when if enquiring afterwards for their wives, or their children, they should learn that they had been dead some time, and their bodies had been given, by order of the Overseers, to the doctors for dissection? Think not this an imaginary case, of a recurrence of which there is no danger, a very short period *may* more than realize it!

When corn was selling at 16s. or 18s. per bushel, landlords, reckless that it might come down to 4s. 6d. or 5s. raised their rents and their expenditure according to the former scale; it is now at the latter price, and they exclaim that they shall be ruined; so having shorn their *tenants* to the skin, they at last come down to scraping the *paupers*, in order, as a great L——r told them, to preserve their estates another year. If self-interest were not the most blinding of all ingredients, it would scarcely be possible to conceive that men (even those who neither regard God, nor love their neighbours) should not discern the inevitably ruinous consequences of such stupid proceedings. The very circumstances of the present times will tend, if

not to accelerate, to encrease the dreadful consequences of the evil when it arrives. Bread is now so cheap, and employment so abundant, that this nation is daily becoming overstocked with the natives of Scotland and Ireland. Under these circumstances, let any one imagine the consequences of a sudden dearth, and stagnation of trade, with the lower classes irritated by the most cruel and needless oppression ! Then there might, indeed, be some cause for the great pauper landowners to tremble lest their estates should not remain their own for another year.

In whatever country the legislators, instead of being (as God and man require them to be) the protectors and comforters of the poor, become their oppressors and unmerciful tormentors, they are assuredly preparing a scourge for their own backs. There is a baseness in such tyranny that is the detestation of God and of all good men, which never fails to be eventually punished. This has always been the case, even where the oppression has been caused by a gradually increasing encroachment on the rights of the poor, unsanctioned by any direct enactments of the government. I apprehend that it was reserved for our *Christian* legislature, consisting of King, Lords, and Commons, (in a Reformed Parliament) to pass an act by which they decreed a punishment, till then confined to the most ferocious of all murderers, to be inflicted, *for no crime*, on one particular class of their fellow-subjects, that class being the one which, more than all others, had the greatest, and the strongest claims on their justice, humanity, and protection. A class which every heart, that is not as hard as a nether mill stone, commiserates. The legislature that dares thus to brave the curses of those who are ready to perish, the abhorrence of all good men, and the denounced vengeance of the Almighty, cannot prosper.

From the first moment when the horrid proposal of giving up the bodies of the pauper poor for dissection was suggested in the House of Commons, I reprobated, with all my might, a measure which I felt assured was iniquitous, and one which must lead to evils of the greatest magnitude. Every duty to God, to my country, to my fellow-creatures in general, and to the poor in particular, called upon me to expose the atrocious nature and fatal consequences which I conceived must follow the cruel and wicked measure, accorded by the careless revellers in luxury to the solicitations of, perhaps, self-interested infidels. Evils, both of a public and private nature, which I predicted, followed with a rapidity and force beyond what even I had contemplated.

Of all the nations on the face of the earth, existing since the creation of the world, *this* was the first moved by Divine wisdom to comply with the requisitions of the *Inspired Word*, to decree a permanent provision for the preservation of the *poor* from perishing for want, in those blessed Laws of Elizabeth, enacted for the purpose. Many countries stood, at that time, before England, in commerce, splendour, and prosperity, but *she* was the only one who dared thus magnanimously to care for the poor, and to *secure* to them an inheritance, as firmly as were the possessions of the Law-makers themselves. Till these infatuated times, those rights have been held sacred ; many

attempts have vainly been made to amend them, but none, till now, to abolish them. From the time when this nation thus wisely and humanely obeyed the command of God, she, *and she only*, has progressively advanced in opulence, commerce, splendour, and prosperity, while all others (then standing above her) have retrograded, till she has attained an elevation, in all those respects, far, very far, above whatever the world has before witnessed. Why, then, is she now gone so mad as to kick away the ladder by which she has been enabled to mount to this elevation?

A few infatuated rulers, men who neither fear God nor regard man, (i. e. man if poor) having exceeded their enormous incomes, (to which they have not so great a right as the paupers to theirs) cast about to find some way, if they could, of adding to them. The very poorest, after mature consideration, appeared to them to be the only class which they could *safely* pillage. They, however, had but 2s. a week each to subsist upon. The *Nobles* thought that 1s. 3½d. would be amply sufficient, and, therefore, they determined that they would appropriate 8½d. of the income of each, to bolster up their splendour a few years longer. What a glorious privilege to be a *Legislator*!

Now, which of the foregoing humane Legislators have title deeds of three hundred years standing? Then those who *have not*, have acquired their estates subject to the poor rates as they then existed; they, at any rate, have then no more right to them, than the poor have to their estates. I know that many of these *Noble* Legislators are as poor as church-mice are in Ireland, and are borrowing money, wherever they can, at 5 per cent., while 4 per cent. is the average—is it then to be wondered at, that they will filch the bacon rind and the potatoe skins from the plates of the pauper poor? But what a precious system of scraping together of candle-ends and cheese-parings for the support of the high and mighty proud Aristocracy of England, must this be? Will not the people soon discover that with Legislators such as these, they are no safer than a flock of sheep in the wilderness under the care of hungry wolves?

To what farther, or worse, steps of oppression can our needy, frightened, foolish legislators proceed than driving the decrepid, aged, and dying poor into crowded prison houses, shut out from their friends, there famished, and their bodies given up for dissection to surgeons' lads? Now let me again ask, is it possible to conceive that *any* people, much less *English* people, will bear all this much longer? It would seem that our Rulers themselves suspect not. Hence may have arisen the otherwise idiot measure of theirs to rid the country of many of those men—the sinews of the State—who might be the first and most formidable in resistance—the young able-bodied men. One of the wise clauses of their sapient Act being to induce parishes to offer inducements to *emigration*, i. e. a bounty for transferring the source of our wealth and prosperity, to America, or to other countries; though, *at this very time*, our orders for manufactured goods cannot all be executed for want of workmen. Thus are our imbecile Rulers proceeding in the path that will lead to destruction.

The DISSECTING BILL was the first step in that downward course

of oppression, which invariably leads to ruin ; that taken, the rest seem naturally to follow.

I foresaw as stated that such must be the case, and I therefore thought it my duty to oppose with all my might a measure which I felt assured would prove as ruinous in its consequences to the country, as it was cruelly unjust to the poor, and disgustingly annoying to every one who either witnessed, or reflected on, its horrible accompaniments. My having done this has been the cause of the disgraceful proceedings which I have now to narrate. This I can never regret—I have gone boldly on in the course of a public duty, and though it is now probable that the result—from circumstances which I could not foresee—may be, in some respects, different to what I had anticipated, I am by no means certain that those circumstances will not eventually prove to be much more advantageous both to myself and to the public, than if my first expectations had been realized.

Throughout life it has been my constant endeavour, and frequent prayer, to be enabled to avoid all recurrence to law proceedings, and it has always been my advice to others to suffer much wrong and loss, rather than seek redress in the usual Courts of Justice. Still, a man may be so situated that it may become his duty to his country, to his family, or to his trust, so to seek redress, but never till he has both by conciliatory measures and prayers, done his best to avoid them. I think then, that I am bound to believe that should the extraordinary circumstances here to be narrated prevent a recurrence to law-proceedings, they may have been wisely and mercifully ordained. Very many reasons call upon me fully to state these circumstances to the public. It is true that I shall have to state some, the relation of which will be painful both to myself and others—but I can neither do justice to myself, nor to the cause without so doing. I must, however, here again declare that against none of those whose conduct I must expose and reprobate do I feel any personal enmity ; on the contrary, there is not one of them whom I would not inconvenience myself to serve as far as public good admitted ; but I shall not shrink from exposing that which the public welfare requires to be made known.

As to the associated cabal of medical men, much as I have heard them talked about, and strange as it may seem, I neither know them all personally—their names, nor even the number of them. I have despised their conduct too much to feel desirous of further acquaintance.

One great object of this publication is to elicit further facts on the subject of their (as I conceive) illegal proceedings, in order that eventually they may be brought to pay that penalty (whatever it may prove to be) which the public have a right to expect from any unjustifiable conduct of which they may have been guilty. My feelings in the case are not so much of a personal, as of a public nature. I trust, however, that I shall not shrink from the performance of a public duty so important as I conceive this to be.

The following concise statement of facts will serve, I hope, to convince the public that, however strange and unpleasant the occurrences may in many respects have been, I have not been induced to sacrifice either the public welfare, or my own conscience, on the altar of self-

interest. I have felt throughout that I have stood on high ground, as the servant of *God*—and therefore I have never felt the least fear of what *man* could do unto me. Let those quake who have done wrong.

The following extract from the “Lecturers Lectured” is, as far as it goes, correct :—

“I am one of the Executors under the will of my late estimable relative, Mr. Jacob Roberts, and have ever since his decease had the letting of the tenements which he possessed. One of them was the house in Eyre-street in which the late Mr. John Green lived. It had been empty more than a year. I had caused a board to be put up directing inquirers to apply to me at the Warehouse in the same street. About a month ago, I learnt, with astonishment, that Mr. Jacob Roberts’s son, (who had a key to shew the house to any one who came,) had made a kind of bargain with some Medical Men respecting their occupying the house as tenants; and that he had given them a key and a written memorandum of a letting of the house to them by the Executors—but without any signature. Of this, however, he had kept no copy, nor did he clearly recollect the contents. I immediately desired that he would inform the parties, that the Executors would never consent to let the house for any such purpose, as it would not only be encouraging what I thought sinful, but would prevent the house from afterwards letting, and would greatly deteriorate the value of the adjoining houses, &c. which likewise belonged to Mrs. Roberts. He did so, and the following morning I was in the warehouse when Mr. Boulbee called to speak to Mr. Sidney Roberts. I immediately told him that I was sorry that he had so inadvertently led them into an error—that he was not authorized to let the house at all, and that the Executors, who alone had the power, never would let it for any such purpose. He said that he only wished to speak to Mr. Sidney Roberts; I therefore left him.

“I did not know who the party wanting the house were, but I understood that Mr. H. Jackson, Jun. was one of them. I had no acquaintance with him, but, in order to give them no further trouble, I went to his surgery. I fully explained to him the circumstances and the situation in which we were placed, and he seemed so satisfied that he said, for his part, he thought that they ought to give the place up, and requested that I would let him have a note on the subject to show officially to his colleagues. I asked him to let me see the memorandum that had been given to them. He said that he would, and went towards his desk to take it out, but stopped, and then said that he had not got it. A copy of this has been sent for by Mrs. Roberts, but has been refused.

“When I got home, I wrote the following note, and sent it to Mr. Jackson :—

““ Park Grange, Sept. 22d, 1834.
“DEAR SIR,—In consequence of the conversation which I had with you this morning, I write for the information of the gentlemen concerned, to state that the premises in Eyre-street, belong to Mrs. Jacob Roberts;—that Mr. Rowland Hodgson and myself, are the trustees under her husband’s will. No person has been authorized to act for us. Mr. Sidney Roberts only held one of the keys for the purpose of having the house cleaned out, and to shew it to any person wanting to see it. I am sorry that his strange conduct should have given you any trouble; but, knowing nothing of the transaction, we could not help it. We, as trustees, conceive, that both that and the adjoining property would be greatly injured. You will therefore perceive that it is our duty to refuse to let it for the intended purpose. Trusting that eventually you will get better suited, I am, Dear Sir, most truly yours,

SAMUEL ROBERTS.

““ HENRY JACKSON, Esq., Church-street.”

“In answer to the above, I, in two days, received the following :—

““ St. James’s-street, Sept. 24, 1834.
“MY DEAR SIR,—I am desired by my colleagues to inform you, that having taken a legal opinion upon the right of possession of the house in Eyre-street, and being informed that such right cannot be disputed, so far as is consistent with their own interest, the Lecturers in the Sheffield School of Anatomy and Medicine, would be exceedingly sorry to do

any thing likely to injure Mrs. Roberts or her family ; and will therefore most willing'y give up possession of the house, *if* between this time and the ninth of October, another house adapted for the purpose can be procured ; and they hope that in the furtherance of the object, you will render any assistance in your power ; but should no such place be found, they are sorry to say that they have no alternative but to retain possession.

“ I am, my dear Sir, your's respectfully,

“ HENRY JACKSON, JUN.

“ SAMUEL ROBERTS, Esq.”

“ Convinced by this, that though they saw clearly that by occupying the house for such a purpose they should be injuring the property of Mrs. Roberts and her family, yet they had fully made up their minds so to do ; though, (whatever their *Legal Adviser* might tell them,) had it been my own property, I would have soon ousted them, and left them, and their *Legal Adviser*, to seek their remedy ; that, however, not being the case, I was inclined to act differently, and I sent the following note to Mr Jackson :—

“ Park Grange, Sept. 24, 1834.

“ DEAR SIR,—I was very sorry to perceive the purport of your letter of the 23th Inst. —I applied to you as a gentleman whom I believe incapable of lending himself to a mean action, and therefore I applied in confidence. I think that both you and the other lecturers know me too well to think that I shall quietly submit to have an advantage taken so untenable, and, I think, disgraceful. You know me to be a man of peace ; you know me likewise not to be afraid of resisting what I conceive to be aggression. I am now called upon to protect the property of the widow and the orphan. I believe that the parties understood that Mrs. R. had no objection to your having the house. Since she knew for what purpose it was wanted, she has been, and still is, exceedingly disturbed. I trust then that the key of the house will be now sent to me.

“ I am, dear Sir, most truly your's, &c.

“ HENRY JACKSON, Esq.

S. ROBERTS.”

“ A few days brought me the following curious epistle from somebody calling himself the ‘ *Lecturers of the Sheffield School of Anatomy and Medicine.* ’ Whether the *Great Unknown* be a corporate or an unincorporating body, I neither know nor care, but of this I am very sure, that the sooner and the more fully, it is dissected, the better it will be for all the town :—

“ Eyre-street, Sept. 29th, 1834.

“ The Lecturers of the Sheffield School of Anatomy and Medicine, beg to inform Mr. Roberts, that the tenor of his note, as an answer to an offer on their part, to accommodate him in every way in their power, has very much surprised them ; and his reply, from its offensive tone, is one which they consider exonerates them from deferring their proposed arrangements any longer ; and they, therefore, beg to inform him, that they shall keep possession, and proceed to make such alterations as were assented to in the draft of agreement.

“ SAMUEL ROBERTS, Esq.”

From these letters and circumstances it must clearly appear to others, as it did to me, that the Doctors were actuated in thus tenaciously retaining possession of premises, never regularly let to them, by a determination to mortify me for having exposed, and opposed, their proceedings in different instances.

Determined, however, to put them still further to the test, I applied to Mr. Thos. Creswick, who I believed had considerable influence with Mr. Jackson, to use that influence with him, to induce him and the others, to relinquish the possession of the premises. He was kind enough not only to do this, but also—unknown to me—to call on Dr. Thompson. They both assured him that individually, they were disposed to do so, and further, that they would endeavour to influence their coadjutors so to do. Besides this, my Solicitor, Mr. Albert Smith (unknown to me) on behalf of Mrs. R. and family wrote the following letter to Mr. Jackson :—

“ Sheffield, 16th Oct., 1834.

“ DEAR SIR,—I am requested by Mrs. Jacob Roberts, to appeal to you on behalf of herself and family, respecting the house in Eyre-street, and to beg that before it is appropriated as a Dissecting Room, the Gentlemen, who compose the Medical School, will pause and consider whether, as against a

Widow Lady and her children, they should avail themselves of the possession they have obtained to the prejudice and injury of the Property, and contrary to the wishes of those entitled to it, and those whose livelihood depends upon the rental of that and the adjoining Property. I do not mean here to admit or deny whether the possession is strictly legal, but supposing it was, the maxim that extreme right is often extreme wrong, might be fairly applied to such a case. And if I knew the gentlemen individually, whom I am unfortunately addressing only as a body, I should at once say, that not one of them would deliberately strain the law to his own very temporary advantage, whilst he caused great unhappiness and pecuniary loss to an unoffending party, unsuspecting that any injury could arise to her from any steps which she had taken or authorised.

"I do hope, that the gentlemen with whom you act, will not hesitate to give up the possession of the house.

"ALBERT SMITH."

To this the following answer was sent :—

"St. James's-street, Oct. 18, 1834.

"MY DEAR SIR,— Having this evening laid your letter before a Special Meeting of the Members of the Sheffield School of Anatomy and Medicine, the following Resolution was agreed to :—

"I am, my dear Sir, your's respectfully,

"HENRY JACKSON, JUN.

"ALBERT SMITH, Esq.

"RESOLVED,—That the Secretary reply to Mr. Albert Smith, to the following effect. That in consequence of our having already commenced proceedings, we cannot think of giving up the house during the present Session, especially as we deny that we are in any way injuring Mrs. Roberts's Property, which we should be very sorry to do."

All prospect of obtaining possession without legal proceedings was at an end. A riot, at the premises, took place on Sunday and Monday, near the end of January.

The following extract from the "Appendix to the Lecturers Lectured" will explain my conduct on the occasion :—

"I was coming down from home, after dinner, on Sunday, when I was met by two respectable young men, who were coming to inform me of a riot which they said suddenly began, about two hours before, in Eyre-street, in consequence of circumstances that had taken place at a building, for which I was in trust, used as a Surgeons' Hall, by a certain number of medical gentlemen, who had separated themselves from the general body.

"My informant stated that an alarming cry of *murder* issuing from the place, a number of neighbours and passengers hastened to it, and, on getting in, found two ferocious looking men and a woman, of much the same appearance, apparently all drunk and quarrelling ; the latter stated that the men had been attempting to murder her, while the conduct of all three was so outrageous, that Mr. Raynor, the police surveyor, living near, was sent for. Mr. Raynor since states his belief, that had it not been for prompt assistance they would have murdered him. (The two men have been committed for the assault.) That the two men, after strong resistance, were secured, and sent off to prison ; but, in the meantime, a great crowd had assembled, many of whom forced their way up the stairs. One of my informants went after some of them to get them down. In the first room he saw, he said, a skeleton suspended ; in another was the body of a man stretched on the floor ; in another was a skeleton in an upright position at the back of the door ; and in a third, the bodies of a man and of a female, the latter partly operated upon, having one stocking on. The stench, however, of the whole of the rooms was so intolerable, that it made him quite ill, while the rush of the people up stairs was become such that it was with difficulty he got down. The other, who did not go up stairs, had got a bone which he had taken from a lad in the street. They said that some of the police officers and constables being

come, they had cleared the house, and that though the crowd had become very great, they trusted that there would be no more mischief done."

Conceiving that the premises were then for the present safe, I did not go near them, but went directly to the church. After service, however, before going home, I sent up to Mr. Albert Smith to desire that he would take care that the premises were properly protected. This was done, and all remained quiet during the night, in the course of which most of the bodies were, by somebody, taken away.

My practice is generally to leave home for the warehouse in the morning about eight o'clock. Just as I was entering into the town on the Monday, a man stopped me to say that the mob were then gutting, and pulling down, the premises. This I saw when I got to the warehouse was the case. Thinking that I should be better out of the way, I went to the Boys' Charity School and the News Room. On going back between ten and eleven, I saw Mr. Smith riding up Norfolk-Street at the head of a troop of cavalry. I therefore took my horse, and left the town for home. On expressing my astonishment to Mr. S., the next day, at the premises—which I had desired might be protected—being left to themselves at that dangerous hour in the morning, he hastily replied, "I am responsible for that," or words to that effect. With what measures he did take for their protection, in consequence of my message, I am unacquainted.

A few days after the riot, a man was taken into custody for being active in it, and eventually committed for trial. A little while after this, Mr. Smith sent for me to say that if I meant (which he conceived was a matter of course) to claim damages of the *Riding*, I should have a Deposition or Recognizance to sign, which must be done that day, as the magistrates probably would not be here again before the time that it must be sent off. He said that he was very busy, but would try to get it ready by three o'clock, if I would then come down to execute it. I got down soon after three, and found that he was just finishing it. Mr. Bagshaw was waiting, seemingly impatient, with his hat on and his whip in his hand, anxious, I conceived, (which was the case) to depart. I of course had not seen the Deposition. Mr. Smith read it in haste, and from the circumstances mentioned, I did not pay that attention to it which such an important document required. When, however, Mr. Smith came to words which seemed to me to affirm that the surgeons were admitted by me to be yearly tenants, I stopped him and distinctly stated that I never had admitted them as tenants, nor did I believe they were so. Mr. Smith said that the words did not imply it, meaning only that they were in possession of the premises, and that they were nothing but a regular requisite technical form of words—or to that effect—and went on reading it. In the evening, however, when, at home, I had time to think more deliberately on the general subject of the Deposition, and the purposes for which it had been prepared and executed. I then felt strongly that I had been doing wrong—not as regarded the tenancy, for of that—after Mr. Smith's explanation I had thought no more; but I felt sure that by claiming of the *Riding* I should be doing injustice—I felt that I had no claim for remuneration from any quarter but from the *Doctors*.

All human laws are imperfect, and cannot be adapted to all cases. One like this could scarcely have been foreseen, and, therefore, could not have been guarded against. Divine laws however, are immutable and perfect—they, I felt sure, denied my claim on the Riding, and I resolved to relinquish it and run the risk of recovering of those, on whom I felt sure that I *had* a just claim. But besides this there was another objection; I found that I had bound myself in a penalty to prosecute a man (who, for any thing that I knew might be innocent) for a crime which would subject him to the punishment of *death*. I here, too, saw clearly that I had done wrong, and I at once resolved to run the risk of paying the penalty rather than prosecute.

The next day I wrote the following letter to Mr. Smith to be shewn when he could to the magistrates, and to be then returned to me:—

“ Park Grange, Feb. 5th, 1835.

“ DEAR ALBERT,—I have now given the subject of the prosecution, &c. the most serious consideration, and have come to a pretty full determination. I shall state as clearly and as correctly as I can, not only what it is, but on what grounds it is founded.

“ When I signed the Recognizance, I had no idea that there would be any prosecution founded upon it, that could, by possibility, subject the culprit to the punishment of *death*. At times, through thirty years, I have published my opinion that the infliction of death in any case—at any rate, in any but the most flagrant ones of wilful murder—was opposed to Christianity. I should, therefore, feel that I should be acting exceedingly wrong, were I in this case, to prosecute a set of thoughtless persons, whose crimes, however flagrant as regards the laws of man, are, in my opinion, in the sight of God, by no means so flagrant as those of others, whom, probably, in this case, the law may not reach. Whatever, then, may be the consequence, I have no hesitation in saying that, in this instance, I ought not to prosecute, but to beg that every practicable indulgence may be shown to the culprits. The consequence, I apprehend, of my refusal to prosecute will be, that I cannot recover damages from the Riding. On the most mature consideration I am convinced that *I ought not even to apply for them*. Nay, more, that I ought not to *accept* of them if tendered, unless other parties, who are guilty, could be compelled to indemnify it.

“ Through a great portion of a long life, I have been endeavouring, in many instances, to benefit the public, and have, I am persuaded, done so to the amount of some thousand pounds; but it was always a rule with me never to accept of a farthing of the public money for so doing, even when it would have been justly due to me.

“ In this instance, however, I feel certain that I have no claim on the public purse. My claim must be made on the party from which greatly more than that is justly due. Throughout the whole of this astonishing transaction, I do not feel that I have any thing whatever to blame myself for. From the first mention of the Dissecting Bill I was most strongly opposed to it. I foresaw the evil consequences, and I stated them boldly to prevent the Bill from passing. In doing that, however, I could not possibly either foresee, or surmise, that a body of medical men, of whom I knew nothing, should, without my knowledge or consent, gain, by what I conceive illegal means, possession of a house of mine and convert it to the horrible purpose which I had decried so strongly. Such, however, was the case; would not, then, the public say—(not knowing but that I had let them the house)—‘see this fellow, who talks so finely, is as bad as the worst of them when he can turn a penny by it; down with such a fellow and his house too!’ Might not the public have been reasonably expected to say and do this, had I not, by the little pamphlet which I had published, fully explained the whole of the vile transaction?

"After that, as they were in possession, and Mrs. R. did not wish me to eject them, I took no further notice of them, and for me, they might have gone on quietly. The late transactions have been all of their own bringing about, by the most unjustifiable proceedings. For all the dreadful consequences to all parties, they only are (at least in justice) responsible. I have done my duty, and I trust shall continue to do it. I feel that at present I stand on high ground, both with the public and myself. Whether I may continue to do so with the former or not, I will endeavour to do so with the latter. I can afford, if necessary, to lose five or six hundred pounds, much better than the approbation of my own conscience. I have only to request that, under all the circumstances of the case, you will do your best for me, as I do not wish to be troubled about it. I have no doubt but that the magistrates, taking every thing into consideration, will be as lenient as the law would admit of.

"I am, dear Albert, most sincerely yours, &c.

"SAML. ROBERTS."

Had the man been convicted and punished, I should still have considered that they (the medical men) were the instigators, and were in the sight of God the more guilty party. *They* could have had no motive for *their* conduct, but a bad one;—*he*, supposing him guilty, might have been proceeding on mistaken grounds, and yet have been actuated by generous and humane motives. His previous character, I believe, was good.

After the Doctors had had their claim allowed, and the man had been acquitted, it only remained for me to determine whether I would proceed against the former for damages or not. I had always asserted that the Doctors had illegally kept possession of the premises, a temporary key being only lent to one of them, to admit the others who had not seen it, to view it, while the paper that was given to him, was only a memorandum of the probable terms which the trustees might require. The Deposition I only signed (after declaring that they were not tenants, and understanding that that did not acknowledge them as such) after which, in "the Appendix" which I published, I again made the same assertion.

"Pray, Honourable Gentlemen, did *I* apply to *you* to take the premises? Did not you know that I had the letting of them? Did you apply to me when you wanted them? Did you not take them of one who, you *knew*, had not the power to let them? Did I not tell you, as soon as ever I heard of your having done so, that he had no such power, and that *I* would never agree to your having them? Did I not call upon you and state fully the cruelty, injustice, and impolicy of your persisting to keep a possession—your doing so being in my opinion totally illegal? Nay, did I not do all but go down on my knees to beg of you (on Mrs. Roberts's account) to procure other premises? and did you not, in spite of all this, persevere in keeping possession? Did you not conduct the business within the walls of those premises in a way that gave rise to reports, exasperating the people against you? Did you not put persons in possession of the premises whose characters you knew were of the most horrible description? Did not they, on the Sabbath day, admit one other, at least as bad as themselves, and, after all getting beastly drunk, did not these men attempt (if not to murder) greatly to abuse the woman? Did she not, amidst violent shrieks, assert and persist in the assertion that they intended to murder her? Was it not in consequence of these dreadful recurrences on the Sabbath day that the exasperated people were collected into a mob? Was it not by the brutal beings who were drunk in the house, that the life of Mr. Raynor, the police officer, was so greatly endangered? Have they not been committed for that offence? Do not

you, Honourable Gentlemen, think that *one* large splendid building for dissecting purposes is quite enough for a town like this? Had not you, gentlemen, formerly—apart from the other medical men—a dissecting house in another part of the town belonging to one of your body? Did not you render it so annoying that he would not have it there any longer? Did you not then join those other medical gentlemen at the Surgeons' Hall, in Surrey-street? Did you not then soon throw all into confusion—quarrel, part, and abuse them in no very polite terms in a letter which you sent to them? And was it not after all this, that, well knowing that nobody would let you a place of his own for the purpose—you applied for, and obtained in the way that you did—my premises in Eyre-street?

“All the foregoing things I believe you did; and from the first it has been my endeavour to prevent the mischief which I foresaw, and foretold, must be the consequence. Yet you, conceiving my hands were tied,—which, indeed, they *were*,—regardless of my entreaties and prognostications, dared to set me and common prudence at defiance. You have now, however, set me at liberty, and I shall dare now for the future to act for myself.”

I had then always, in reality, been consistent in denying their tenancy—as to the Deposition (if it meant any thing) it was from the first day withdrawn. It was never acted upon—nor, unless my legal adviser, who was the professed promoter of my interest, as opposed to them—acted either weakly or worse—no one has since seen it, or knows what was in it when I signed it.

Mr. Smith's conduct in the business it must appear, from what has been said, had been any thing rather than satisfactory to me, but there were other reasons which compelled me to think that, if I proceeded against the medical men, I ought to employ another Solicitor. I felt exceedingly sorry to do so, but after very long and mature consideration, I concluded to consult him (Mr. S.) on the propriety of at least associating another with him. I had a high opinion of Mr. Broomhead's professional talents and exertions—he had had the defending, with success, of the accused Rioter. He, therefore, had become more fully acquainted with all the circumstances of the case than any other person whatever; I consequently concluded that *he* would be the most proper person. I wrote then in the most friendly confidential way to Mr. Smith, stating that I thought for reasons which I should mention, that he himself would be of opinion that another had better take the lead in the cause, and that I should be glad if he would act with Mr. Broomhead. I stated that from his relationship to Mrs. Roberts and family, many things (as concerned Sidney) might make it unpleasant;—that it might, too, lead to jealousies with the magistrates, to whom he was clerk. I mentioned other concerns of his which might suffer from it, and, on the whole, I thought so little of his being offended that I took no copy. Within an hour or two, however, the following letter came to the warehouse:—

Sheffield, April 15th, 1835.

“DEAR SIR,—You must act as you think right in conducting your Suit against the Surgeons. I have not been so dull as to discover the situation in which you meant to place me. The *real* cause of your determination is, I have no doubt, one which I have often before been made to feel, has operated to my disadvantage. In a professional point of view, and looking to the emoluments of my business, as the means of maintaining a large family, you could not have wounded me more deeply than you have done; in other respects I feel it as any thing but a dishonour that you should prefer Mr.

Broomhead to myself—with him, you must excuse my saying, I shall decline to advise in the manner you propose.

“I trust I shall be spared the pain of further correspondence on the subject, and remain Yours truly,

ALBERT SMITH.”

Though I was both astonished and grieved to receive such a letter from him, it served to remove a great difficulty, and to leave me perfectly at liberty to take my own way. I wrote in answer to say that if he had given the subject a fifth part of the consideration, before he had written, that I had done before I wrote to him, he never would have written such a letter as that. I told him that when he first started as a professional man, young and inexperienced (*having no family*) I, at great risk, as I believed, to myself—solely to serve him—withdrew my business from an experienced, highly respectable, professional man, whom I had employed more than twenty years—to give it to him, yet was not that professional man any way offended.

I further told him that, though I had thus, to serve him, given him my business at the time, I had by no means bound myself to him for life. That he might make himself easy on the score of being troubled with much of my correspondence—but that I should certainly—so far as he was concerned—consider myself as a free agent.

Notwithstanding this, I did not call on Mr. Broomhead till some time after. When I did, before I had told him that I meant not to employ Mr. Smith, he told me that, thinking he (Mr. B.) would be of use, he had spoken to Mr. S. and told him that he believed he could, and should be happy so to be. This I was very glad to hear. I then told him of my intention to put the cause into his hands without saying one word of Mr. Smith's behaviour. He, supposing that Mr. S. would be as glad to act with him, as he would have been to have assisted him, consulted Mr. S. on some important points, but not a word of information could he obtain from him. Mr. S. only put his fingers to his mouth, crying MUM! It was not till I had taken all my papers to Mr. Broomhead that he knew of Mr. S.'s letter. Still he was disposed to hope that he would not withhold any information that might be required.

The first question to be decided was “*were they tenants?*” It was very clear that neither I, nor Mr. Hodgson, had ever let the premises to them, but, on the contrary, I had, from the very first, told them that I never would let them to them. Mr. H. they had never seen. *They* affirmed that *Sidney* had let them to them. On Mr. B. enquiring of Sidney, it appeared that Mr. Cundell, the carpenter, knew something about it; he was therefore sent for, and the Depositions of both taken, when they were together, in which they both agreed. The Depositions as given by each are as follows:—

“Mr. SIDNEY ROBERTS, of Sheffield, Silver-Plater, says that about the 16th or 17th of September last, defendants John Green and Henry Boulton called at Mr. Roberts' Warehouse to ask to look into the house in question, and witness went on with them to look at the house, and they informed him that it was wanted for a School, for Lecturing in, connected with their profession—that on looking through it, they said they wished some other persons con-

nected with them (not then naming them) to look at it. Asked what rent it was, and witness told them £30, which was the rent it had before been let at to Mr. John Green; that in the conversation with the defendants Boulton and Green, it was suggested that a memorandum of the terms for letting should be prepared if the house suited them, and it was ultimately agreed upon that they took the house, and a list of the fixtures therein put down in writing.

"That as witness latched the door on leaving the house, Boulton and Green said they should like Dr. Thompson and their other colleagues, to see the house, and witness, as he had one of the latch keys in hand, said you may take it and shew it to them, as I have another key if I want to go in, and witness gave it to them for the purpose of shewing Dr. Thompson and their other colleagues.

"That Boulton and Green mentioned that if the house suited, a partition wall between the two front chambers would be required to be removed, to throw the two rooms into one, to be used as a Lecture-Room, for which purpose, they stated, it would be wanted, and it was to be ascertained whether that alteration could be made.

"That after the above interview, on the same day, witness prepared a Memorandum in writing, purporting as follows to the best of witness's memory, he having kept no copy, viz. :—

Sheffield, September 18th, 1834.

"MEMORANDUM that agree to take the House, Out-buildings, Stable, and Yard, situate in Eyre-Street, from the above date, of the executors of the late Jacob Roberts, as Yearly Tenants, at the Rent of £30 per Annum, to be paid Half Yearly; naming the Fixtures in an annexed List or Schedule upon the same paper.

"That Witness delivered this Blank Memorandum to Mr. Boulton in the evening, who took it and said Mr. Jackson was gone out of town, and when he returned he would shew it him, and they would consider the matter and see witness again.

"That nothing more was then said, but in a day or two afterwards Mr. Boulton came to Mr. Roberts at the Counting-house, No. 5, Eyre-Street, and asked witness to accompany him to the House he wanted to take, and told witness they (meaning him and his Colleagues) wanted the House to lecture in, as they had before stated.

"That witness went with Mr. Boulton out of the Counting-house, and informed him that he would fetch Mr. Joseph Cundell, the Joiner, to give his opinion as to any alteration, and meet him at the house which was only about one hundred yards off.

"That accordingly witness saw Joseph Cundell, and they went to the house in company together, and found the defendants, Messrs. Boulton, Green, Overend, Jackson, and another or two of the defendants whom witness does not remember, who were looking through the rooms of the house, and Mr. Cundell was asked by some of them, whether the two front chambers could be thrown into one; that Mr. Cundell, on examining the wall, said they could.

"That after some further conversation as to the mode of doing it, either Mr. Jackson or Mr. Boulton (who took the most active part) asked witness to sign an agreement which they produced, and witness, without examining it, or making any further observation thereon said *he could not, as he had no power to sign any agreement, as Mr. Roberts and Mr. Hodgson were the Executors, and he referred them to Mr Roberts*; and they appointed to meet again on the matter on the following Monday, September 22d, 1834, when the matter was to be further considered by the defendants.

"That witness says at this time there was a board upon the house with an inscription thereon "To Let," referring to Mr. Roberts, at the Counting House, No. 5, Eyre-street.

"That on the following Monday morning, September 22d, witness informed Mr. Roberts for the first time what he had done, as above stated—who was very angry with him at having even shewn the house to them.

"That Mr. Boulton came on to Mr. Roberts's Counting House on the morning of the 22d September, and saw Mr. Roberts and witness; heard

Mr. Roberts ask Mr. Boulton if they wanted the house for dissecting in ; who, after some hesitation, answered, ‘ sometimes it might be used as such ; ’ whereon Mr. Roberts told him *that the Trustees would not let it for the purpose of dissecting in on any account, and added that no person had any right to let it but the Trustees.* Mr. Boulton then said, he wanted to speak to witness, and Mr. Roberts left witness and Mr. Boulton together, and witness accompanied him (Mr. Boulton) again down to the house, and he found about the same number of Surgeons there as before.

“ Witness says, as Mr. Roberts had thus decided, he (witness) told Mr. Boulton he could be of no use, but went by his desire to satisfy him.

“ That as they went to the house, witness told Mr. Boulton that Mr. Roberts would not consent to let the house for dissecting in, he was sure, and witness told those of Defendants who were at the house, he could do no more in the matter, as the Trustees objected.

“ Mr. JOSEPH CUNDELL, of Sheffield, Builder, says that some time about the middle of September, 1834, Mr. Sidney Roberts called on witness about nine o’clock in the morning, (does not remember the day of the week,) to go to the late Mr. Jno. Green’s house, in Eyre-Street, Sheffield, to examine as to some alterations, and witness accompanied him there and found Messrs. Boulton, Green, Overend, Jackson, and another person or two he did not know—all of Sheffield, Surgeons ; these parties appeared to be looking at the Rooms in the house, and witness was asked by the Surgeons his opinion whether two front chambers could be thrown into one by taking down the partition wall. Witness answered after examining it that they could. That the Surgeons in witness’s presence then wanted Mr. Sidney to sign an Agreement or paper which one of them held in his hand, and he answered that Mr. Roberts and Mr. Hodgson were the Trustees, and he could not do it, and referred them to Mr. Roberts to conclude the matter with them, and witness soon afterwards left the house.

“ Witness says that he knew the Property to be that of the Trustees of the late Mr. Jacob Roberts’ deed. A Board which he had put up by Mr. Roberts’s direction was put on the House with the following Inscription, viz. : “ TO LET, Enquire of Mr. S. Roberts, Counting-House, No. 5. Eyre-Street.” which soon afterwards was taken down.”

It was not till Mr. Broomhead asked me, if there was any allusion in my Deposition to the Medical men being tenants, that I at all recollected that there was a passage in it to which I had objected, as hath been stated. I then told him that I was *sure* there was. He said that it would be necessary to see it, and he would at all events ask Mr. Smith about it. When I called again, he had seen Mr. S. and asked him. He was very reserved upon the subject—he believed that the Deposition was sent to Wakefield—he could find no copy, but he assured Mr. B. that there was *not a word in it as acknowledging them tenants.* Mr. B. was not satisfied with this assurance, but wrote to Wakefield for a copy. He received for answer that it had not been sent there. (When I had refused to confirm it, I had desired Mr. S. to keep it.) Mr. B. again waited on Mr. S. who then told him that he believed it must have been sent to York. To York then Mr. B. wrote for a copy, but with no better success. It had not been sent *there.* On applying again to Mr. S. he still would not know any thing about the original, but sent a paper, which he called a *copy*, and the following letter :—

Sheffield, May 20th, 1835.

“ Sir,—I have this morning laid my hands upon Mr. Roberts’s Deposition. I feel it right to send you a Copy, and having now put you in possession of

all I know on the subject, I must desire I may not see you again about it. I have a right to require this, and shall insist upon it. The Deposition itself was found among the Papers, and was therefore not returned to York as I supposed—but *I have no doubt Samuel Younge has either a copy or minutes of it.*—Your's, obediently,

“ALBERT SMITH.”

As it clearly was not a copy, but a first draft, we could not tell how far it was correct. Nor could we tell whether the adverse party were acquainted with the contents or not—it was desirable to know this, and Mr. B. wrote to enquire.

Sheffield, July 16th, 1835.

“DEAR SIR,—By your Uncle's desire I beg the favour of your informing me, whether or not Mr. Younge had a copy of your Uncle's affidavit, or what knowledge he had of it, if any? And please also to say whether or not you will deliver up the original to your Uncle?”

“I am sorry to say that I see he feels sore, and expected you would have treated him differently. I would recommend you to see him, and to keep friendly, and on doing so rely upon my assistance in forwarding such a determination. *Indeed I will do any thing that may be suggested to forward a good understanding between you.*—I am, Dear Sir, Your's truly,

HEN. BROOMHEAD.

“ALBERT SMITH, Esq. Solicitor.”

The following is a copy of Mr. S.'s second letter:—

Sheffield, July 16th, 1835

“SIR,—Messrs. Wilson and Younge, on behalf of the Lecturers of the Anatomical School, and myself as the Solicitor to the Trustees of the Property acted in concert, as it appeared necessary and right we should do, in arranging the preliminary measures for each party, to recover the amount to which they are entitled from the County—and we each had access to the Documents of the other, *but I don't know or believe that Mr. Younge has any Copy of Mr. Roberts's Information.* The original is in my hands, I consider, as Clerk to the Magistrates, and I cannot give it up.—Your's, obediently,

“ALBERT SMITH.”

From this epistle and the preceding one, contradicting each other, it may be surmised (not known) that Mr. Younge knew all about it.

My own opinion has long been that the proper mode of proceeding in this case with the Medical Confederators, will be by an indictment for a CONSPIRACY. The definition of a *conspiracy*, in “Burn's Justice of the Peace,” is as follows:—“*By the common law, there can be no doubt but that all confederates whatever, wrongfully to prejudice a third person, are highly criminal.*” If this be now law, I think that no person, when he shall have read what I have said and have to say, respecting the conduct of the MEDICAL LECTURERS, will entertain much doubt respecting their being guilty of the afore-mentioned crime.

That I was the object of their malignity, I think no one can doubt; neither can any one doubt but that it was for having endeavoured conscientiously to discharge my duty to God and my fellow-creatures. Their object was clearly, by secret and unjustifiable means, to possess themselves of premises, which *they knew to be mine*, (there being a board upon them, to inform every one of the fact) in order to apply

them to a purpose to which they knew that nothing could have induced me to consent to their being applied, viz. to that of *dissecting the bodies of paupers obtained from the workhouse*. The evidence of Mr. Sidney Roberts and Mr. Cundell, as have been adduced, and which they are ready to affirm on oath, are completely conclusive that they (the Lecturers) KNEW that they had no right to retain possession of them for a single hour after the key, which had been lent to them to view the premises, had been demanded of them. The former person, of whom they have since asserted that they took the premises, told them at the first, before the latter witness, when they wanted to inveigle him into signing some paper on the subject, that *HE had no authority whatever to let the premises, as myself and Mr. Hodgson were the only persons who could do so*. Still, even after I had accidentally met with one of them, and told him the same, they persisted in keeping possession of the key. Nay, they did the same, even after all the aforesaid correspondence had taken place with them on the subject, as well as after the personal application of Mr. Thomas Creswick to two of them, who both signified their own consents to give up the key, and also *promised their influence to induce the others to consent likewise*. These two were evidently then not free agents. Both, I believe—one of them at any rate—was most highly obligated to Mr. C., and would have obliged him if he could; but it seems that he could neither induce the others to consent to give up their prey, nor could he himself be permitted to leave the confederacy. If all this cannot prove the existence of a *conspiracy*, I scarcely know what can!

The Lecturers went, however, further than this. They had asked Mr Sidney something respecting the throwing of two rooms into one, and they affirmed that *he* had agreed to it; but when they found that *I* would not let the premises to them, (well knowing that they were only trespassers) instead of asking me to do it, they had the audacity themselves to set workmen to destroy the property as a dwelling house, converting it into a human butchery. This was long before the riots took place, and when I had never been with any of them, or corresponded with any of them, excepting to tell them *that they never should have the premises*.

Here, then, certainly was a conspiracy to effect an illegal act; an illegal act that finally led to the destruction of the property. The individual, who throughout has acted as the efficient foreman of the confederacy, declared, both to me and to Mr. Creswick, *his* willingness to give up the key, but affirmed that the other confederates would not. Admitting it to be a conspiracy, it may be asked, how am *I* injured by it? Every way; in character, in peace of mind, in property. I would not have let the premises to any persons, *for such a purpose*, for two hundred pounds a year, nor indeed on any terms. They pretended to ground their right to possession on the paper which Mr. Sidney had given them, which was merely as a memorandum of the terms which he *thought* it probable the trustees might agree

to ; hut this important paper nothing has been able to induce the Lecturers to produce, though they have been tried in almost every way. On the trial of the rioters at York, one of them, on being closely pressed to produce it, I believe, *swore* that it was burned by the mob ; and yet, I understand, that they profess to have it still. I dare venture to say, however, that they will never produce it. Now, if all these things do not constitute the acts of "*confederates wrongfully to prejudice a third person,*" *common sense* had better go to sleep. I shall, however, be very glad to hear the opinion of others upon the subject, to influence future proceedings, either for or against.

I can safely affirm, that I shall be far from experiencing pleasure in causing the imprisonment of so many members of a respectable profession, which, I conceive, must be the consequence of their being convicted of a conspiracy ; a result evidently appearing to me naturally to follow their being put upon their trial. I am sure in that case I shall not be vindictive, but shall beg of the judge to be as lenient as a regard to public justice will admit of. There are, I believe, some among them who have *families*, and it would be a pity that their families should suffer for the crimes of others. Still, a close regard to public duty forbids the giving way too much to the feelings of humanity. It will soon be seen how far these associated Medical Gentlemen are entitled to pity.

I never had the least acquaintancc (that I know of) with any of them ; they could not then, I think, have any *personal* enmity against me. As to Mrs. Roberts, she certainly would not have offended any of them, any more than her daughters would ; as to Sidney, so far from being at enmity with him, they had (I understand) both long before, and have ever since, been striving to be on the very best terms in their power with him. (More respecting this hereafter.) Even had I unknowingly given personal offence to some one of them, I could not have so offended them all. I did not know them as a body. On what grounds, then, except those mentioned, can it possibly be conceived that they could have been *all* so determinedly resolved to annoy me, that, rather than not do so, they would sacrifice the property of the widow and the fatherless, who had never offended them ? With one of whom, at least, they were intimate, and they employed that intimacy to render him an unsuspecting instrument in annoying me, and also in injuring the property of his mother and sisters.

The premises were by no means well calculated for the purpose ; they required considerable alterations to render them at all useable ; many others would have been much more eligible : it was not, then, the *place* that they wanted (indeed they had one of their own.) No ; they were all, it appears, in some way *bound* and quite determined, at whatever risk, at whatever loss to others, to annoy *me*. Individually, each appeared ashamed of the transaction, but they were combined for the purpose, and the purpose must, by some means or other, be accomplished.

It has been shewn by the early transactions, and by the letters that

they wrote and were commented upon in the "Lecturers Lectured," that I was aware they were resolved to go great lengths; but I was then far, very far, from being acquainted with what I now know; nor am I in all probability acquainted now with any thing like the full extent of their combined machinations. I was, from the first, convinced, that they never had obtained any legal right to retain possession: but I was not then prepared to state the efforts which Mr. Thomas Creswick had made to induce them to return the key, with the assurance of two of the leaders of what I deem the "*Eyre-street Conspirators*," that *they* were individually disposed to do so, but also that they would use their best endeavours to induce the others to comply. But it proved, as one of them told Mr. C., that some of his coadjutors were a *little perverse*. Neither was I then informed of the letter sent to them by Mr. Albert Smith, to plead the cause with them of the widow and fatherless whose property they were so cruelly and unnecessarily injuring, any more than their cold-blooded shuffling reply. Neither was I then acquainted, as I have become since, of the persons whom they employed, and the way in which they proceeded, at their own will, to dilapidate the premises of which they had possessed themselves. But, above all, I was unacquainted with the whole of the clear evidence which Mr. Sidney and Mr. Cundell are ready to affirm on oath, as hath been stated, respecting their endeavouring to entrap him (the former) into signing some kind of a paper upon the subject of letting the premises, with his distinctly telling them, in the presence of Mr. Cundell, *that he had no authority whatever to let them, as it could only be done by myself or Mr. Hodgson*, any more than of his afterwards only *lending* them the key, in order that they might shew the place to their coadjutors who had not seen it.

With all the foregoing circumstances, I was then unacquainted. Yet, on this unsigned paper, on this his telling them that he had no power to let the premises, on this his lending them the key in confidence, as men with whom he was acquainted, have they had the assurance to ground a claim to *legal possession*!

They do not profess to have any witness to any agreement, but they assert that they have a written document of the letting. The production of this document would have settled the business at once; they have been called upon from the first, in all ways, to produce it. But, no; it is something too precious for vulgar eyes. Their foreman would willingly return it; nor was I acquainted with the history of the memorandum paper which was required to be produced on the trial at York, when the witness (their principal manager) declared, on oath, that it was consumed during the riot, but which is since stated by some of them to have re-appeared.

Now, let it be recollected, that all these are men of such high honour and fine feeling, that, to ask them when they demand money of respectable tradesmen, to shew on what grounds the claim is founded, would be resented as an insult; yet will not one of them all pay a bill of the first tradesman in the town, without *his* first furnishing him with the *particulars* of the bill.

Well, we have seen by what means they obtained possession of the premises, let us now proceed to examine how (after having caused them to be dilapidated) they proceeded to use them. I had, in the "Lecturers Lectured," put them fully on their guard: not only stating the horrible nature of the proceedings, which, under such circumstances must ensue, but also that the eyes of the public (whose feelings they were going to outrage) would be constantly upon them.

Yet, in spite of all this, as if in mere wantonness of insult, and recklessness of consequences, they put persons in the sole care of the premises, of the most notoriously flagitious character. The premises were the resort of wild young men, at all hours, as the neighbours have conceived, for the vilest of purposes. It were shame, I have no doubt, even to speak of the things there done by them in secret. Exhibitions of parts of bodies were made in the yard, while the use that was often made of such parts, *within the premises*, was but too plainly visible, by the state of the walls of the room at the time of the riot. (See evidence given on the trial at York.) Such were the disgusting proceedings with the bodies on the removal from the workhouse, that the Overseers themselves were compelled to remonstrate. How they came in possession of some of the bodies which were found on the premises at the time of the riot, remains to be proved, as it was clearly seen that they could not have all been from the workhouse. They were, however, some way disposed of during the night; no enquiry being made after them; and no coffins appear to have been seen.

Proceedings such as have been stated continuing to annoy and disgust the neighbours in a way that would have greatly injured the surrounding property—the feelings of the lower classes were naturally greatly excited. In the midst of this increasing abhorrence, was the cry of "Murder" heard, on the noon of the Sabbath-day, from the wretched woman, who, with her infamous husband, had been put by the coalesced medical men in occupation of the premises. Oh! what have not the ungodly Rulers of States to answer for, who, impolitically, as well as wickedly, oppress, by partial and cruel laws, the poorest of the poor! Retribution never fails to follow on themselves, while the nation, at the same time, is equally suffering! Could such Rulers only be shown one-half of the sin and misery, and loss to the country, of which such laws are inevitably more or less productive, they must shudder with horror if they did not repent with deep compunction. Thousands on thousands of unoffending poor have been, and are, rendered miserable by this vile act; while a comparatively small, though really dreadful part of the great vileness of which it has been productive, is clearly, and strikingly manifested in the conduct (in this instance) of a number of men, liberally educated, and moving in a sphere of respectability. What a dreadful crime it is for rulers to lead a multitude to do evil!

The aforesaid united gentlemen had endeavoured in vain (as it appears out of maliciousness to me) to induce Mrs. Roberts's son to do that which he told them he did not possess the power to do—an act injurious to the interests of his widowed mother and orphan sisters.

They, however, like the great tempter of mankind, were not satisfied with the first failure in leading astray a young man, who, unhappily, seems to have thought too well of them, and who was therefore not sufficiently on his guard. They, in fact, knew him better than he knew either himself or them. I think that *I* know them *pretty* well, but to the *bottom* of the following transaction, I cannot dive.

Notwithstanding the illegal way in which I affirm that they obtained, and kept, possession of the premises in question—they have always asserted that they were regular tenants at least for a year. Well, but mark the honourable, open, straight-forward proceedings of these worldly-wise ones. One of them, who has from the first kept as much as possible out of sight in the business, and who from his being a native, and very respectably connected, ought to have held such transactions in abhorrence, has, I have long perceived, been playing, what appeared to him, a deep game. He has throughout been, I conceive, laying traps for Mr. Sidney, and courting, even after the riot, his acquaintance. To stand well with him, he lately either gave him, or sold him very cheap, a horse which, in a very short time, was very near breaking his neck. I do not believe that this was foreseen, though, as he was likely to be an important witness, such an event might have served their cause. This, however, is only introductory.

To the house in Eyre-Street was attached a stable of which, along with the former, they took and kept possession. Now, then, after the riot, and after the aforesaid horse-transaction, and before the expiration of the year, for some deep purpose or other, did this said *young* gentleman (I understand) apply to Mr. Sidney to let them their own stable, for one of them, who is an M. D. to put a horse in. The application was not to me, who, Mr. S. had told them alone, had the letting of the property—but to him, though he had before assured them that he had no power to let. To let them *what* was the application? To let them *that* of which they professed to be in legal possession, as a part of the property in question. But the most extraordinary part of the transaction is that—(I suppose in gratitude for all favours) he (Mr. S.) did, after all, let them, what they called *their own stable*, as much as one man, without being authorised, can dispose of the property of another. Now what could possibly be the object of this sapient gentleman in thus overreaching a young, unsuspecting friend, I can not divine. That it had an object, and that not a very honourable one, I cannot doubt. It was, however, much of a piece with all the rest. Whatever it was, I have no hesitation in affirming that it hath been, or will be, completely frustrated.

I told those honourable gentlemen at the first, that they would be entrapped in the works of their own hands—and surely never men were sunk so low as they have hereby been in the scale of respectability! Every occurrence has served to sink them lower and lower. The very abjects seem to cry out against, and despise, them. It is the actuating motive that sinks them. What was the crime by me committed? I was residing in the town in which I was born, and in

which I had always lived—protecting—according to my humble means—as much as I could, the rights, and the well-being of the lower classes, through more than half a century ; surely then, I was not improperly obtrusive in boldly and strongly reprobating a public measure, which I felt certain would be at once cruelly unjust towards the poor, and at the same time injurious to the safety and prosperity of the country, by withdrawing the affections of the lower ranks from the higher ones, and at the same time disgusting every pious, sensible, and humane man among the middle ranks. My anticipated evils as likely to result from such a measure, have been already, in a great degree, realized.

For the foregoing attempt, has this combined effort of a body of medical men—many of them strangers—been directed against me. It has long been asserted (I fear with truth) that Medical Schools are schools of *materialism* and *infidelity*. If, then, that was the case when there was at least some restraint on the wanton sporting of youths with the ever sacred remains of mortality, and the ever sacred feelings of the best of the living—what is to be expected when there is a license for the most vile licentiousness among those just-liberated youths, congregated together to corrupt and encourage each other in setting all decorum and decency at defiance ? What kind of men are we to expect in future to be admitted into the most respectable private houses at all times, under all circumstances—unrestrained among the females, and at the end of the year to put their hands into our pockets, and help themselves to whatever they like, and at the same time openly telling all of us that they would not take *our* word for sixpence ? Now I will boldly ask all my fellow-townsmen—if they believe that it would be possible to take eight or ten individuals promiscuously from among any one respectable class of manufacturers in Sheffield, whose conduct, as a body, could, under any circumstances, be so disgracefully reprehensible, as that which has been here feebly described as being that of the aforesaid LECTURERS ? I trow not ! Yet my fellow-townsmen—ye poor, honest, humble souls ! these honourable—right honourable gentlemen—are all ! all ! LECTURERS ! Young as they are—they have “*walked the Hospital*.” You have seen lately in the *Iris*, what that means—and so they are all now qualified, and kindly disposed, to astonish and enlighten all those of the old school among us, who have been silly enough aforcetime to be content to *walk to Church*, to be then *lectured* by some old parson in a great wig. Oh, what wonders has the last half century produced ! We shall no doubt soon have *Infant* Lecturers on Medicine ! Indeed I would *now* much rather hear such as they are, lecture as they walk in the School, than any of these hobbletyhoys who have lost their former simplicity of children without having obtained any true wisdom as men. As I have said before—they are little better than penny trumpets.* While I am upon the subject of

* On the subject of young Medical Lecturers, see the *Life of Sir James Mackintosh*. On the subject of their public conduct, see the account of their blackguardism, at the Crown and Anchor lately, respecting Apothecaries' Hall.

Lecturing, I will myself just give the Lecturers another Lecture. Some of them, I understand, have taken the liberty of finding fault with the size of the shed or lodge for a horse, which forms one side of the gateway to the Infirmary, because I had some hand in the designing of it, i. e. I was a member of the weekly board when the plan was ordered, examined, and decided upon. They complain, I understand, that it is not big enough to contain all the horses and gigs of all the medical men at this time going there, few of whom it seems can *now walk* so far. The fact was this, a Porter's Lodge was judged absolutely necessary, yet it must not be too large to be in due subordination to the building. Now, as occasionally, a medical man (Mr. Webb, for instance) might even then come on horseback, it was thought that a corresponding shed or stable, might, at times, *possibly* be useful. The one now there (after four or five meetings of both Guardians and Subscribers) was unanimously ordered—re-ordered—re-re-ordered, and at length finished. Now it will hold all that it was intended to hold—i. e. *one* horse comfortably, and another if the supernumerary be put with his tail where his head should be.

Perhaps nothing can well be adduced to shew the rapid increase of medical men here, in number, consequence, and some other qualities, than the circumstance alluded to. Fifty years ago, there were not, I apprehend, more than ten or a dozen of all kinds in the town,—now, I conceive, there must be more than a hundred. I do not apprehend that there were then three who kept a horse, nor one who kept a carriage. Mr. Staniforth, sen., set up the first, and he (i. e. *while he continued to make out BILLS OF PARTICULARS*) used to say that he never made four hundred a year by his professional practice. Now the medical men, with their horses and gigs, and livery servants, are as numerous and as dangerous upon the road, as milk lads and butchers' boys with their asses, horses, and carts, all driving or riding at such a rate, that it seems something like a mercy if a sobergoing man on horseback gets safe home, especially on a Saturday,—this is really something like being *Doctor ridden*. I often think what a deal more good the stuff that the lads are taking to *their* customers will, most probably, do them, than that which the medical men are going to prescribe, will do to theirs, and yet I suspect that if an honest farmer, or a butcher, was to attempt to help himself to his medical customer's money at the end of the year, without showing them that it was due, he would stand a chance of being let blood for nothing.

Our good-natured tradesmen, however, (though all of them declare to the contrary), *really seem to like the plan*. When Charles II. had drained his lay subjects to their heart's content, of their cash, he (being in want of more) consulted two of his Bishops, whether he might not legally help himself to some of the property of the Church—one of them, without hesitation, said that he might; the other was mute till he was commanded to answer,—when he replied, that his Majesty might certainly legally take that of his brother, who had so fully sanctioned his so doing. So I say, that now, the medical men

may for me, freely help themselves from the pockets of all others, (and the more freely the better) since they have given their tacit consent to their so doing. Both parties now know each other pretty well. I have shewn the people what the Doctors are, and the Doctors have long since found out what the people are. At any rate, it seems they knew them much better than I did,—who have been for more than twenty years trying, for the sake of the poor, to rid the town of a practice so vile that no really honourable tradesman would be guilty of it, if he had free leave. For this the Doctors did not love me much better. I have done my best, and since the people will not lend a hand, they may take the consequence. I will be cat's-paw to no drones, nor unnecessarily tempt the Doctors to act dishonestly.

I trust that my letter to Mr. Smith, for the perusal of the magistrates, will convince the public—if not so convinced before—that I am not to be induced to do what I am assured is wrong, for fear of a trifling loss. I have found by long experience, that doing right is not only the duty of every man, but that it is also the best policy. In this case I could shew that it hath been so. To the public, at any rate, the occurrence has been highly beneficial.

Let any one attentively recur to the astounding facts which have been stated in these pages, as relates to the conduct of the medical men; let him then imagine those which such men have in all probability secretly perpetrated under the accursed act; afterwards, let him try to conceive what would have been the case in a few years in this town, had they not been thus providentially stopped, and exposed in the very commencement of their career; and I think he will admit that scarcely any price could be too much to pay for such a blessing. As Doctors never long agree, except when compelled by something thus honourable, we might by this time have had such horrible cutting up places in all our best streets, and the young practitioners rendered more flagitious than they even now are. In Dublin, I see the hospitals are advertising for pupils, with the inducement of as many subjects for dissection as they may wish for. So might it have been here, and in other places in England, but for this timely check. Does any one know who is our District Inspector, where he was at the time of the riot, and what he has to do (if he does his *duty*,) for his salary? We are precious governed; I fear, that bad and influential as O'Connell is, there is a being even worse, and more influential than he, who is leading our rulers to ruin the country by the most cruel, unnecessary, and wicked acts. This neither would, nor could, be the case, were they not themselves, too often individually, his willing slaves. Let, then, the *people* do *their* duty; amend themselves, and remonstrate with their Rulers.

The *people* I believe, are the real conservators of the state. The way in which almost all public concerns seem to be managed, would really appear calculated only to effect the ruin of the nation. Let our Rulers only once fully enable the people by such vile oppressive and disgusting laws as the Dissecting Bill and the Poor-Law Bill—to

perceive that they are to be bled to death to supply the exhausted frames of the higher ranks with life-preserving blood, and I apprehend that the inevitable consequences will not be long in following.*

Will the people of this country submit to have *despotic power* placed in the hands of needy assistant Poor-Law Commissioners by which thousands of afflicted, unoffending poor, may be brought, by starvation, to a premature grave? Will they suffer their own feelings to be continually outraged by the bodies of such poor famished creatures being given up, by wholesale, for dissection to such honourable men as have been combined to be revenged on me for opposing their cruel oppression? I think not. At any rate, were all the medical men in the country opposed to me, I would denounce all such measures as ruinous to the state, as well as disgusting to the people.

I know that it hath been generally said—that *I* ought to have *claimed of the Riding* for damages. My then Solicitor told me so; the Solicitors of the riot-creating doctors likewise told me so, and told me so, I believe, out of pure regard; but I told them that—whatever might be *law*—they were not the keepers of my *conscience*, nor would they have to answer for me at a future tribunal. In the first place, however, *I* was *not* the person (if any one ought) who ought to have applied. The *occupant*, the law says, is the proper person. The *owner* may be in a distant country—if at hand, he *may* apply. I was sure that in justice and equity, the Riding was not the party which ought to sustain the damages. I knew if they did pay them it must be from either negligence, ignorance, partiality, or fear of the consequences of investigation. It would then have been wrong—knowing what I did—either to tempt *them* to give—or *myself* to accept of it. I have always conceived public property to be as sacred as that of individuals—and I should not like to receive a few hundred pounds from a man as a debt, who really owed me nothing. I am sorry that such scrupulosity, as to the public property, is not a little more general. There are a few rather striking instances of this truth connected with this case, to which I mean to allude.

I (as were likewise the combined Medical men) was bound to prosecute a man, who had by an individual been accused of having been actively aiding in the riot. In my letter, to Mr. Smith, to the Magistrates, I stated my reasons for refusing to prosecute. The more I have since reflected on the subject, the more I am convinced that I was right in that refusal.

The accused person was of good character; he was only accused by one individual, and he (if I have not been mis-informed) would gladly have withheld his evidence; and, after all, it appears that he had been mistaken, since, after a full hearing, the jury declared the accused *innocent* of the crime imputed to him. Now, though this innocent person escaped condemnation, he did not escape punishment.

* I see by the public prints that a select Committee of the House of Lords has just been formed to devise methods of raising the price of corn, and consequently of bread to the poor, and that at a time when they have just been robbing the paupers of a part of their legal scanty pittance. God, they think, has been too bountiful. Will HE not be avenged on such a people?

Besides a very great expense, he suffered a degree of punishment, which, to a respectable man as he was shewn to be, and to an innocent man, as the jury declared him to be, must have been horrible ; his character was blasted ; he was accused as a felon ; committed to prison as such ; and confined (I conclude) with such, for several months. Was not this a punishment such as no compensation could repay ? What would all these *innocent* Medical Gentlemen have thought and said, had I accused them, on oath, before the Magistrates, of a vile *conspiracy*, and they had all, consequently, been committed to durance vile for three or four months, with the worst of all the raggamuffins of the county ; had I, when they were brought to trial (though I could prove that there was a conspiracy) not been able to prove that *they* were the conspirators, I having forgot the colour of their coats, would they not have thought that they had some little reason to complain ? But, would *they* have a *right* to complain ? Do they not know that *they* were the sole cause of the *imprisonment* and sufferings of a person (probably far better in the sight of God than themselves) whom a jury has declared innocent ? Probably they may not believe in a judgment to come, when every man will receive according to the things done in the body, whether it be good or evil, else they would, I think, have a fearful looking for of the result of that day.

Well ; but my principal motive in bringing this subject forward, is, the circumstance of this person's imprisonment, on the sole oath of an individual, whom, it seems, the jury thought mistaken. Now, in a case like this, ought not the jury to have the power of awarding some degree of compensation ? The most respectable man living, having given offence to some bad man, might be accused by him before the Magistrates of a crime like this. They would have no alternative but to commit him, it might be for five months, to prison. The accuser might not appear against him, or, appearing, might fail in convicting him. Nay, the innocence of the accused might be fully established. Ought not such a man to have *some* compensation allowed ? The accuser, as in this case, might only have been mistaken ; but to the accused the result would be the same. This is thrown out for the consideration of the Legislature.

We will now go on—*Even-handed* Justice is always desirable, and is the boast (whether possessed or not) of this country. Let us examine a little into this. We have seen in the foregoing instance how anxious the immaculate medical men, and the Magistrates, were that strict justice should be dealt out to the individual of good character accused by one person of rioting, both the Doctors and myself being bound by them to prosecute. Now then, there was another person of the most vile character brought before the same Magistrates, accused, not of an *intention* of maiming some one, but accused of having *actually* maimed one severely, and that one an officer of justice in the discharge of his duty. But farther than this, he was accused by the said officer, of maiming him with an intention of committing MURDER !

Besides this, the man's own wife had just before alarmed the neigh-

bourhood, on the Sabbath-day, with a cry of MURDER, accusing her husband of the attempt. These charges did not rest on the sole evidence of the officer, *numbers* were ready to corroborate the evidence. Well, what did the Magistrates do here? Of course they committed the man accused of murder, and bound the officers to prosecute! No! nothing of the kind! They left the latter to do as he pleased. Well this constable was likewise the officer at the head of the TOWN'S POLICE, at the head of an Institution established, at great expense, and supported at the cost of, perhaps, six or seven thousands a year, to preserve the town in comfort, peace, and order. To this Institution a little expense could be no object, but the due administration of justice must be of the utmost. They of course would urge their officer to prosecute the wretch who had caused the riot, broken the peace of the town, and not only *assaulted* the officer, but had attempted to *murder* him. No! nothing of the kind! A meeting of the Commissioners (no doubt carefully packed by the Doctors,) was convened to determine whether their officer should, or should not, prosecute a man who had attempted to *murder HIM*, the *PEACE preserving officer of the town*. Who were the leaders in this meeting? The Solicitor of that Medical Squad, which had put the accused wretch in possession of the premises; another Solicitor, who was the efficient agent in the execution of the *notorious BONDS*, by which a considerable number of poor unsuspecting workmen were incarcerated at York, while their families were a charge to the parish.

This gentleman (who would, I believe, professionally, move heaven and earth, if he could in any case for a guinea) *moved* that the police officer *should not* prosecute the man whom he had accused of causing the riot, and also of attempting to *murder him*. Some of the medical squad themselves took an active part as peace-preservers on the occasion, particularly the justly-esteemed gentleman who *bolted*. No! not a BEE—but the mysterious written agreement which was called for on the trial at York. By this *precious Conservative Body of the town then*, it was (as might, under the circumstances have been foreseen) determined that the man accused of attempting to *murder* their HEAD OFFICER should *not* be prosecuted for it. Does any one require to be told *why*? If they do, I can only refer them to any one who was present at the time when the accusation of the wretch was made, and the evidence heard before the Magistrates.

Alas, for *even-handed* justice! Alas, for poor Sheffield! if such be the proceedings of those—the guardians of her safety, and the managers of her funds? The Doctors well knew that the trial of this man would have blown them up completely. But I understand that there is a Clerk of the Riding residing here who, I conceive, receives some trifling perquisite for taking care that the said Riding is never imposed upon. He, I apprehend, ought, if he thought that the Doctors had themselves been the cause of the riot,—to have opposed their claim to remuneration. Now, whether it was from want of talent, of information, or from orders from above, or from some

other cause, I cannot tell,—but I have never heard that he opposed their claim at all. So that they got their charge allowed before the trial of the suspected rioter came on. Justice is said to be blind,—she may be so : which may be the reason that her attendants have ways and means of *leading* the poor good lady wrong. Well, the old proverb may be true, that “they must needs go whom the d—l drives.” *Where* they go to is another question. There will be some pretty disclosures at the *last assizes*, when there will be no concealment, no bolting of writings, no respect of persons ! I know whose place I would there and then rather stand in, of the aforesaid prosecuted or his prosecutors ?

Well, but then, the public may say, “Why when the evidence is as clear as the sun at noon day against the combined Lecturers, do you not proceed, without delay, against them, as a duty which you owe to the public ? You have strong and clear evidence that they illegally kept possession of the premises,—that they illegally caused serious dilapidations to be made in them,—that without leave they applied them to the most revolting of all purposes, and that in a way which both must, and did, so strongly arouse the public feeling of indignation, as to lead to the demolition of the premises ?” This is all very natural, and all very proper to be asked, and I will try to satisfy all such querists, though, in so doing, I must necessarily give pain both to myself and to others whom I would gladly have spared, but common justice to myself and to the public demands it.

I am aware that I have been censured for not employing my nephew, Mr. Albert Smith, in the cause. In being thus painfully compelled to give my reasons for so doing I shall, I believe, fully answer all the aforesaid questions, as well as afford other important information with many useful lessons.

Mr. Smith, I had soon reason to believe, was in too frequent and intimate communion with the solicitor of the defendants, a man not likely to be indifferent to the interests of *his* clients, to one of whom he was nearly related. From this quarter, I cannot but conceive that Mr. Smith must have been led to believe that Mr. Sidney had, in some way or other (for he did not profess to know how), so committed the Trustees, that the Doctors had really become legal tenants. It is well known, that I always positively denied this. It has now been clearly shewn that I was correct. It has been stated that when I heard of the premises being attacked on the Sunday, I sent up to Mr. Smith (as Clerk of the Magistrates) and my Solicitor) to desire that they might be properly protected, and I received for answer that they would be. On coming to the town, then, on Monday morning, soon after eight o'clock, I was much surprised to learn that the mob were then at work, and had half destroyed the property. Some of the medical men, I understand, were busy during the night in packing off, some way or other, to some place or other, the dead bodies, and then left the place to take its chance. This was at the workmen's breakfast hour. Mr. Smith knew that I was always at the warehouse very early ; it was in the

same street ; as, then, I had ordered the property to be protected, I surely ought to have been consulted before the protectors were sent away. They all, or part, might have been kept in the house out of sight. What could the people think, knowing that he was my solicitor, and near relative, but that *I* wished the place to be destroyed. Such was, consequently generally reported. What the combined medical men, who had got illegal possession of the place, did towards its security, I have never heard ; nor whether their solicitor was consulted before the guards were sent away. The not keeping of the protectors on the place, as I had desired, was the cause of the property not being then preserved,—a few lads only beginning the destruction.

Now, though this conduct of Mr. Smith certainly led to the destruction of the property, I do not regard it, by any means, in so unfavourable a light as his subsequent treatment of me. My endeavour almost through life had been to serve the family, and himself, of late, in particular. Nor can I recollect a single instance in which I ever gave him the least just cause of complaint.* If there be such, I shall be glad to be informed what it is, in order that I may have an opportunity of explaining. The only instance in which I can conceive he might think that he had some cause for complaint, I will, *for the good of the public*, here state.

A female at a distance had an unsettled claim upon an estate, which I had, from circumstances, been compelled to take to ; I of course wrote to her on the subject, wishing to come to some arrangement. She referred me to her solicitor, to whom Mr. Smith wrote, but could rarely get an answer to repeated letters, at all under three months, and then proposing nothing ; at length we went to him together, but nothing satisfactory could be obtained. More letters passed but still nothing done, till, after some years, a notice came from him that he had commenced a suit in Chancery against me. I did not know the lady, but I understood that she was respectable, aged, and possessed of very little property. I saw at once that whatever might be the consequence to *me*, *she* must, if the cause went on, be inevitably ruined. I felt convinced that there was only one way of preventing the dreadful consequences, viz., to see the party myself. I told Mr. Smith my intention. He said that it would be *irregular*, but that I might do as I liked. I did so, because I felt assured that I ought to do so. I found a most interesting old lady and her daughter, the latter perhaps forty. The cottage beautifully clean and neat ; they were possessed of a few hundred pounds, on the interest of which they could, with the utmost frugality, contrive to live in respectability and comfort. Her Solicitor lived at a market town at a few miles distant. She was astonished and confounded to hear that he had instituted a suit in Chancery. She had years before put the matter into his hands to get it settled, and she neither knew of our letters, nor of the suit ; yet had I not thus acted *irregularly*, she and her daughter would

* As intimated in his letter of April 15th.

have been *regularly* ruined. The matter was then soon arranged and settled. If this be the case which Mr. S. conceives "operated to his disadvantage in a professional point of view," I must acknowledge that I was guilty of acting in the way that I have stated. I can recollect nothing else, and I do not think that I shall generally be condemned in this. I know that I have been by many people accused (perhaps by no one more than by Mr. S.) of an obstinate adherence to my own plans. I can, however, truly say, that when I have adhered to what are called *my own plans*, I have rarely had reason afterwards to repent; but when I have from haste, inattention, or wish to please, adopted those of others, I have generally been wrong. An instance of each has been here related, viz., that of the Widow's case, and that of the Deposition. If Mr. S. will only impartially consider that *his* conduct, in the first place, caused the loss; in the second, by leading me into error, paralyzed all proceedings against the trespassers; and in the third, is now withholding the knowledge perhaps requisite to my obtaining redress, and will then recollect the relative situation in which we stand to each other; he hardly can be surprised that, after almost twelve months, I have at length taken what he may deem *my own way*, even though he may call my so doing *obstinacy*. He must recollect that *I*, too, have feelings and have a character to sustain, as well as property to care for.

When under the circumstances which have been related, I was induced by the hurry of the case and the confidence which I reposed in him as Clerk to the Magistrates, as my Solicitor, and as a near relative, to sign the Deposition which appeared to imply my acknowledging the Medical men as tenants. I only signed it, *on Mr. S.'s assurance*, that it did not imply any such acknowledgment; I did not certainly then evince any want of confidence in Mr. Smith. Here was the sole cause (if such cause really exists,) of my not being able to recover damages of the Medical men for the destruction of the premises. From knowledge very recently acquired, I am disposed to think that by a proper application to the Court, the Deposition might be set aside, as it was signed under a false impression, and never was acted upon.

The document which he (Mr. S.) at length sent, stating it to be *copy* of the deposition, (which it could not be) was replete with erasures and interlineations, and it must, I should think, have been, at least, *dictated* by the solicitor of the adverse party. I am, however, fully convinced that it is very different to the one which I executed, which it appears nothing can induce Mr. S. to produce. Is not the *Deposition itself* in the hands of the medical gentlemen? I greatly suspect that it is, and if required to be given up, may be *bolted* too!

How could Mr. S. think of sending the document in question to Mr. B., after having so decidedly affirmed to him *that there was not a word in the Deposition intimating that the coalesced medical men were tenants*? In his letter to Mr. B. of July 16, 1835,

he says, "I do not know, or believe, that Mr. Younge has any copy of Mr. Roberts's information, (Deposition). The original is in my hands;" though in his of the 26th of May, he had said "I have no doubt Samuel Younge has either a copy or minute of it." To which he politely adds, (addressed to Mr. B.) "*I must desire that I may not see you again about it, I have a right to require this, and shall insist upon it.*" Mr. B., in a letter to which the foregoing is a reply, states, "I am sorry to say that your Uncle expected that you would have treated him differently, and I would recommend you to see him and to keep friendly, and, on doing so, rely upon my assistance; *indeed, I will do any thing that may be suggested to forward a good understanding between you.*" I think it only justice to Mr. B. to state, that when he perceived that Mr. S. was so offended, he several times offered, if I would consent, to relinquish the cause to him, at the same time aiding him, gratuitously, all in his power.

It will be understood by the public, that my recovering damages rests, according to all the legal advice which we have been able to obtain, on the wording of the Deposition, as relates to the Lecturers having been admitted tenants; without this, they were clearly, and decidedly, TRESPASSERS, and though this document was never acted upon, and though, before signing it, I distinctly stated that I did so on an understanding that in so doing, *I was not* admitting them tenants, still my having signed it, *might* (if we could get to know what the words were) render it imprudent to proceed on those grounds. We might, with assurance of success, proceed against them as *Dilapidators*, but then I must admit them to have been tenants, which I never did, *nor ever will!* The fact is not so, and, therefore, no prospect of gain shall induce me to admit it.

I am persuaded, that the sure and just ground of proceeding against them, is that of a CONSPIRACY. It was this (I do not scruple to call it) *accursed combination* to annoy me by the injuring of the unoffending widow and the fatherless, that led to the whole of the subsequent abominations and evil results. I am only wanting a little more knowledge of the previous facts. I do not think that eight or ten such medical men (of all men except fiddlers the most inharmonious) can be likely to hold together much longer, some one or other of them may be conscience-struck, or induced by some less Christian-like motive, to let out the truth. In which case, I shall think (however unpleasant) that I have a public duty to perform.

Having thus laid the whole case before the public, who are greatly interested in it, I think that I may, in confidence, ask that public, on whom, *in justice*, ought the loss which must be sustained, to fall? On myself, on Mr. Smith, on the combined Lecturers, or on the Riding? If I ever had a claim in JUSTICE on the latter, I have it still. But I never had; nor would I accept remuneration from that quarter, if offered. If the Riding paid me, the money must be misapplied; nor do I believe that it would *ever* have been granted had the whole case been previously fully known. My opinion is, that our Legislators who voted for the Dissection Bill,

ought to be at the loss out of their own pockets. If all the money that they all possess, were to be given to the nation, it would be a poor remuneration for the horrible consequences of that inhuman, worse than savage (savages never passed such a bill) enactment. It is only wonderful that they have not passed a bill that the bodies of all paupers dying in the *Workhouses*, to which *all* paupers are now to be committed, should be sent to the nearest Legislator to feed his hounds and pointers with. They have the same right to decree the one as the other. Perhaps this is kept in reserve lest their estates should be in still greater danger. Alas for the poor man's lamb, when the rich man possesses power over it, and wants to make a feast! The prophet says, (I don't think that many of our Legislators will believe him) "He that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days, and at his end shall be a *FOOL*." What say the *new Poor Law* makers, what says the late Lord Chancellor to this?

The circumstances narrated in the foregoing pages are replete with instruction the most important to various classes of men, to none, however, more than to Legislators; all the evils that have arisen in this case, have originated in the impolitic and wicked measures of our Rulers. They have this one most important truth to learn and practice, that whatever in the government of states is either immoral, unjust, or wicked, must be in the end impolitic and ruinous. A word to the wise is enough, but fools despise wisdom and instruction. I fear, then, that on such, the foregoing relation will produce but little effect. To those persons who may be solicited to accept, or have accepted executorships, these pages may be instructive, as showing that they ought not to engage in such trusts hastily and unthinkingly, but deliberately, and with a full determination to act steadily and faithfully, even should the difficulties (which is always very probable) prove greater and more lasting than they had anticipated, adhering always promptly to the strict letter of their trust. Those whose property is left to the care and management of others, these pages may serve to convince that they should never, by any secret unadvised measures of their own, give unnecessary pain to their trustees, much less unadvisedly counteract their well digested efforts, and thereby, perhaps, frustrate them in their best services to God and their fellow creatures. Much trouble and much loss have frequently resulted to both parties, from not strictly attending to these rules. Lawyers and their Clients, too, I think, may both of them learn as much from these pages as will repay them the price of the book, even without my saying any more upon the subject than I have already done, not that I think them much wiser than others, but because I do not like carelessly to handle edged tools. The same reason prevents my detailing the advantages which might be derived from the perusal of them by Magistrates, still I trust that those advantages will be obtained, and duly, and usefully, applied by them. It is not from the same cause that I abstain from pointing out, at length, the important lessons which all those who have taken upon themselves the highly

responsible office of faithfully applying *public property* without favour, partiality, or respect of persons, may here learn, for though, to me, they are not bound to render an account, yet they will have an account to render, and to prepare for that, I now leave them.

HOW TO CHEAT THE DOCTORS.

I am sure that it is not out of revenge that I am now going to try, in some sense, to *cheat* the Doctors. My principal object in so doing is, by declaring what I conceive to be the truth, to benefit my fellow creatures in general. I am aware that I shall startle my reader—whoever he may be—by the bare *surmise* that there might be less pain and misery experienced in the world, (knowing as the world is now become), if there were to be no professional medical men in it, and that, on the whole, people would then live as long as they now do. The surmise (if it reaches that) does not mean that, in that case, there would not be hundreds of thousands who would consequently suffer *more*, but that possibly there might be ten times that number who would suffer *less*, especially if all will adopt the plan that I shall recommend ; at any rate it may be well briefly to consider the subject.

We are assured in the Scriptures, that the time will come when *religious teachers* will be unnecessary. I have not the same authority for saying that *medical practitioners* will be likewise then dispensed with ; but I am very sure that there are hundreds of thousands in the world who will think that the latter class of human beings could be the better spared of the two. There are two attainments respecting which almost all mankind are continually solicitous ; the acquisition of them has, therefore, always been more important to the generality of mankind than the attainment of gold, yea, than much fine gold. When that is the case (as demand always produces supply of one kind or other) there is never any lack of men ready to take advantage of the necessities, wishes, or weaknesses of their fellow-creatures. Such men make it their object (as they think it their interest) to increase, rather than to diminish, the desires, the fears, and the consequent sufferings, of all others. For this purpose they are continually devising new methods or means adapted to strike the imagination, and calculated to convince their deluded followers that *they*, and *they only*, possess the power of procuring for them the objects on which their hearts are the most set. The objects alluded to are, the attainment and preservation of *health* here, and the assurance of obtaining *eternal happiness* hereafter. These objects have probably been more or less longed for among all mankind ever since man existed.

Professors, then, of the *healing* and the *saving* art, (real or pretended) have always existed, in numbers proportioned to circumstances, therefore the wiles of empiries, of both kinds, must, during

the period of almost four thousand years,* have been very extensively exercised. As the fears of mankind have in neither case abated, as the love of money, distinction, and power, still maintain their accustomed influence; and while gullability continues to exist, it is, at any rate, *possible* that somewhat of the same deception may, in both cases, be now going on?

At present I have only to do with one class of the aforesaid professors, and it is a little remarkable that that one seems to be more disposed to suspect pretences in the other than the generality of mankind are. Does this arise from their conviction that human nature is the same in all situations? I believe that the history of the world will shew that under circumstances equally favourable, the increase of people (in times when there were no Doctors worthy of being called Doctors) has been generally greater than it is (from births) at this time in England. In China, women breed like cats, so that they are forced to drown the children like kittens. What then would be the case if, there, the people could get enough to eat? In the wilds of Ireland, where many are half (often quite) starved to death, and, of course, never see a Doctor, they increase so fast that the country cannot, in its present state, support half of them. I lately noticed in the account of a Moravian station, on the dreary coast of Labrador, (for the year) among a population of about two hundred, fifteen births, and not one death. No illness mentioned. I have long known a considerable village to which, fifty years ago, Doctors' visits were like those of angels' (coming from a great distance,) being few and far between. I should think that the average amount then paid to medical men, in the whole parish, did not reach five pounds annually. The people, however, lived so long that one of them was complaining of *theirs* being a short-lived family, since none of them had ever reached beyond ninety. They have now two medical men, *doing well*, though there are likewise others in the neighbouring villages.

Whence arises it that medical men are said to be so averse to the calling in of their brethren when they themselves are ill? If doctors really did know a great deal about the nature of common complaints, is it probable that new modes of treating them should, during the last seventy years, have been so frequently adopted, and perhaps soon changed for others? Some of those modes have been for the time almost universally adopted, others only by one party, and opposed by another. I am not alluding to those empirics who have every now and then been astonishing the country, duping thousands, and perhaps killing hundreds, by such fancies as *earth bathing*†—by celestial beds,—by animal magnetism,—by the effects of music,—by tractors,—by sympathy,—by living on half-

* I never asked my friend, Mr. Montgomery, if there were Preachers and Doctors in the *World before the Flood* or not. *He must know!*

† By the by, that earth-bathing gentleman had nearly finished his own course here by a bull dog getting a sight of his wise head when all else of him was under ground.

boiled vegetables,—by sleeping all the year round with their windows open, and by sucking in the morning air on an empty stomach, with twenty other fooleries ; but I am alluding to such treatment and remedies, as have been adopted by a great part of the regular practitioners for a while, and then discarded. I could mention many, but far more will recur to the recollection of those medical men, if we have any, who have been forty years in practice.

How comes it to pass that men who have enjoyed so many advantages of education—so much of the experience of others—of the practice of the Hospitals, and of attending dissections, should so very often fail in the cure, and even the discovery of the nature, of surgical cases, which have been afterwards (shewn by incontrovertible evidence,) understood and cured by some of the Whitworth-doctor tribe, who probably never witnessed a dissection in their lives? How comes it to pass that in our Infirmary, a place in want of neither funds, nor room, nor conveniences, nor the best surgical aid that the town can afford, there should be more sloughing of wounds, and more fatal failures in important surgical operations, than was experienced in regular practice when dissection was very rarely resorted to?

Let it not, however, be supposed that I mean to propose the discarding of the medical tribe altogether ; on the whole, I think that they are become a necessary appendage to the existing state of society. They are like fire, air, and water, useful to a certain extent,—but when too abundant and rather ruffled, often fatal ; at any rate it has been shewn very clearly, that there is no occasion wantonly to outrage all the best and finest feelings of humanity, and to violate the laws of mercy and justice to amuse a superabundant litter of sucking surgeons, to the disturbing of the peace of society, and the safety of the town.

I never was an advocate for individuals quacking for themselves ; if due care and a little rhubarb and magnesia will not do, let them go to a doctor and do as he bids them ;—whoever wishes for those occasions to be very unfrequent, let him provide himself with the only *medical book* that I should ever recommend any master of a family to admit into his house. Let no one, however, be without *that*, nor fail daily to consult and pay attention to it. I mean the BIBLE. The way to do without doctors, is to preserve the body in a healthy state. To do this, let youth begin early to attend to, and to follow, the directions contained in that medical *publication*,—especially in the latter part of it. No one need be afraid of looking into that for fear of being led to fancy that he has twenty complaints from which he is free ; nor does he need to be afraid of what it recommends either doing him harm, or of failing to do him good. Those things which it recommends may not (for they are not designed to do it) prevent his *ever* having any illness, but they will render illnesses much less frequent, much less virulent, and very often greatly beneficial. They will produce equanimity and placidity of temper, with cheerfulness and alacrity ; they will give, also, tone, strength and elasticity, to the body,—all of which are peculiarly

adapted to lessen those ailments man is heir to. The prescriptions are not like many of those of the Doctors, unpleasant, if not nauseous, to take ; nor are there any evil results likely to ensue—as in some of theirs—from taking a scruple too much. There, too, is this advantage, which the prescriptions of the Bible possess over those of medical men, viz.. that they are invariably beneficial to the *soul* as well as to the body, while they are, in almost all cases, so far from being oppressively expensive, that the taking of them is frequently attended with a saving of expense.

I do not *know*, though I may guess, whether it be in consequence of the Bible's being so calculated to lessen the necessity of having recourse to medical men, that they are (if report be true) so generally disinclined to the perusal and dissemination of it. I would, however, strongly recommend every master of a family, nay, every individual, even before feeling unwell, to practice the directions therein given. It were vain to pretend here to give any thing like the whole of the prescriptions to which I allude. I will, however, shortly state a few. *TEMPERANCE in all things*, is one which it strongly recommends, (let no one be afraid of taking too much, remembering, that it is good for all, and at all times.) —A strong dose of meekness, gentleness, and good-will, will always do you good. Cheerfulness, diligence in business, as well as fervency of spirit, are likewise strongly recommended. So are patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. I have just mentioned these as a specimen. You need not mind weighing the quantity, take of them freely, full or fasting, as often as you like, and I will venture to say, that you will have much fewer bodily ailments than you otherwise would have had, no doubt to the mortification and loss of the doctor. But don't forget, if you have not got the book, to buy one immediately, and examine it yourselves for prescriptions to suit your own case.

Besides all the invaluable general prescriptions in the aforesaid Medical Book, I will, by way of saving the Doctors still more trouble, and their patients pain, and perhaps expenses, now give a few simple general directions which I think may be useful. I do not, however, mean to send a Bill in after Christmas. They are not I know all so much to be relied upon as those before-mentioned ; they will require more discrimination in their use and application.

HAPPINESS is in fact the one pursuit, to the acquirement of which the two before-mentioned objects are only means. Indeed health and happiness here cannot be entirely separated ; and it is wisely and mercifully ordained that the same means contribute to the attainment of both, and are at the same time within the reach of all classes of mankind, and more particularly so of the lower classes. Health and happiness are the most certain to be obtained by those who have little time to spare for seeking them, and employ that little in rather providing them for others than for themselves. No man can at *all times* possess either of them, nor at any time, in full perfection. The failure of health is indeed in many instances productive of happiness, and very often the preserver from misery. A wise man then will only

desire that degree of health which God may see to be good for him—while he will strive to apply even the want of it to the purpose for which it was sent.

No man can long enjoy either health or happiness, whose conduct is not such as his own conscience approves; he is the most likely to obtain and retain them whose time is not only the fullest but the *best* employed. Let all candidates for them, therefore, keep early hours; and, if they must doctor a little (I would recommend *blistering* to them) let them *blister* their own feet with walking, their hands with working, and their seats with riding. Let them pay all due attention to their worldly concerns, but avoid as much as possible all *undue* anxiety respecting them. Easy digestion is the one thing needful to preserve health, and nothing disturbs digestion more than a troubled mind. The stomach is, indeed, the source of almost all bodily complaints; a constant attention, then, to *that*, is quite requisite to the allowable cheating of the doctors. Never overload it, by putting too great a variety of food into it at once. The plainer and more nutritious the food the better. Beef, mutton, or game, with plenty of vegetables and bread, are the best, generally speaking, for dinner, which should be the only full meal. Avoid young meat and rich pastry. Now and then a feast, sometimes a fast, may not do the stomach harm. The stomach will generally regulate the bowels; but a strict attention must always be paid to them. Regularity there is quite requisite, but don't try fancies; a very little rhubarb and magnesia will generally suffice. Drink no spirits but the best brandy, (of course with water) and that only when you feel certain that it is required. Never drink wine when it does not taste as good as usual. Keep your feet warm and dry; wear flannel next the skin. Don't generally muffle up too much, but avoid taking cold. When you have taken one, attend to it *immediately*. Eat little; put your feet in hot water at bed time; have the bed warmed; take a little plain gruel; keep your head and feet warm all night. If the cold is not removed, repeat the same. A stitch in time often saves much after work. Always be good humoured when you eat your dinner; it assists digestion wonderfully. The Doctors say don't eat too fast; I say eat as you feel disposed. An active man, when well and happy, cannot eat slowly. If you attend pretty well to these directions, your frame will be kept in that state, that, if you should receive any accidental bodily injury, you will stand a good chance, with proper treatment, of a speedy recovery.

You may say that "the foregoing advice is all very good, but that you cannot be expected to attend to all of it." Very well: I have only been telling you what will be likely to increase your health and happiness. You know the alternative. You must have the Doctors often feeling at your pulse, and, once a year, in your pockets. They, too, may perhaps say, as the musician said to Dr. Johnson, when he had been roughly telling him that he knew of no use that fiddlers were of, "But, Doctor, you know that it is necessary that we should *live*;" to which the Doctor replied, "Sir, I do *not* know any thing of the kind."

In conclusion, I must again disclaim all malignant feelings. To serve the cause of holiness and of the country, I entered upon this subject. The combined Medical Lecturers chose to be avenged on me if they could : I was, therefore, compelled to resist them ; and they have only themselves to thank or to blame for the result, whatever it may prove to be. They, as well as Mr. S., knew that I was not in the habit of tamely bearing insult, and that if they insulted me, it must, therefore, be at their peril. I trust that I have endeavoured to do right in a good cause, and God will always, in his own time and way, defend the right.

SHEFFIELD :

PRINTED BY WHITAKER AND CO., IRIS-OFFICE, FARGATE.